

13th November 1922]

- (f) No. It was not a matter that would ordinarily be brought to the notice of Government, but the Government have now, for the benefit of the hon. Member, obtained a report of the facts from the District Magistrate.
- (g) No. The Government see no need for any inquiry.
- (h) The District Medical Officer had no concern with any warrant for arrest and was unaware that it had been issued. He admitted the patient, because he was ill.
- (i) Seeing that no convicted prisoner escaped from custody, the question does not arise.

*The Public Prosecutor of Masulipatam.*

327 Q.—S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the public prosecutor of Masulipatam is appearing on behalf of the Government in the criminal appeal filed in the District Court of Kistna by the convicted Butchayya and others, against the judgment of the Gudivada Divisional Magistrate;
- (b) whether the same public prosecutor is also appearing for Butchayya and his father-in-law in certain civil suits pending in the same Court;
- (c) whether the rules, if in existence, will allow such an arrangement; and
- (d) whether the Government are satisfied that justice will not suffer if the same vakil appears for and against the accused in the same Court, though the cases are different?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.

(c) There are no rules to the contrary.

(d) The Government cannot answer an abstract question.

*Public prosecutors in the Presidency.*

328 Q.—Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state, in continuation of question No. 1248 by Munshi Muhammad Rahman Sahib at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 14th February 1922, the names of all the public prosecutors in the Presidency with the following information:—

- (a) age,
- (b) dates on which they were first appointed,
- (c) whether the rule requiring officers to be retired at the age of 55 or 60 years will apply to these officers,
- (d) whether, while the term of office is limited to three years at a time, the same individual can be appointed indefinitely any number of times; and
- (e) what was the scale of fees allowed formerly and now, and whether reduction of public prosecutors' fees was one of the items to be taken into consideration in the retrenchment scheme?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the "List of Establishments of the Judicial Department." The Government have no other information.

(c) No.

(d) Yes: if they are best fitted for the post.